



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,453	02/21/2002	David Puig-Oses	020276	1015
23696	7590	02/06/2006	EXAMINER	
QUALCOMM, INC 5775 MOREHOUSE DR. SAN DIEGO, CA 92121			HALIYUR, VENKATESH N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2664	

DATE MAILED: 02/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

all

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/081,453	Applicant(s) PUIG-OSÉS ET AL.	
	Examiner Venkatesh Haliyur	Art Unit 2664	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1 page</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1– 9 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1,5,6,8,9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zhang et al. [US Pub: 2004/0013103].

Regarding claim 1,5, Zhang et al. disclosed in their invention of “Communication of Control Information in Wireless Communication Systems”, a method for controlling the operation of a quality feedback channel in a wireless communication system for determining a channel quality value associated with a transmission channel, determining a condition of the transmission channel, if the transmission channel condition is favorable, then transmitting the channel quality value over one slot of the channel quality feedback channel, and if the channel condition is not favorable, then transmitting the channel quality value over a plurality of slots of the channel quality feedback channel [Figs 1-6, Para 0001-0033, abstract].

Regarding claim 3, Zhang et al. disclosed the condition of the transmission channel is based upon a power level estimate [Para 0014].

Regarding claim 6, Zhang et al. disclosed transmitting the channel quality value over more than one slot of the feedback channel by repeating the channel quality value over a frame of the feedback channel [Para 0001-0026, abstract].

Regarding claim 8,9, Zhang et al. disclosed a method for improving the reception of a channel quality value at a base station, comprising, determining whether the condition of a feedback channel from a remote station is favorable, if the condition of the channel is unfavorable, then transmitting a control signal to the remote station, wherein the control signal triggers a reduced rate mode for transmitting the channel quality value over a feedback channel from the remote station, and if the condition of the channel is favorable, then allowing the remote station to control the transmission of the channel quality value over the feedback channel [Figs 1-6, Para 0001-0065, abstract].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2,4,7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang et al. [US Pub: 2004/0013103] in view of Ponnekanti [US Pat: 2002/0150065]

Regarding claim 2, Zhang et al. disclosed transmission (traffic) channel and feedback channel [Para 0001-0008, abstract] but fails to disclose the condition of the transmission channel is based upon a velocity estimate.

However, Ponnekanti disclosed in their invention of "Communication Systems" a detecting and estimating means for the relative movement (velocity) of transmitting and receiving apparatus [Figs 1-17, Para 0017-0019].

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Ponnekanti on the method of estimating relative movement of transmitting and receiving apparatus to include in the system of Zhang et al to detect the condition of the transmission channel based upon the velocity.

Regarding claim 4, Zhang et al. disclosed sending the quality of the transmission channel in the feedback channel but fails to disclose the condition of the transmission channel is based upon whether a fast fade occurs in the transmission channel.

However, Ponnekanti disclosed a method for determining whether a transmission signal has faded or not [Figs 1-17, Para 0019-0021, 0230-0232].

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Ponnekanti on the method of determining whether a transmission signal has faded to include in the system of Zhang et al to determine whether a fast fade occurs in the transmission channel.

Regarding claim 7, Zhang et al. disclosed transmission (traffic) channel and feedback channel [Para 0001-0008, abstract] but fails to disclose determining the traffic channel condition is unfavorable if a first station and a second station travel at a high

Art Unit: 2664

velocity in relation to each other and the first station originates the feedback channel and the second station originates the transmission channel.

However, Ponnekanti disclosed a method for determining the traffic channel condition fades if relative movement (distance) between the transmitting station (first station) and receiving station (second station) increases (travel at a high velocity in relation to each other) and the first station originates the feedback channel and the second station originates the transmission channel [Para 0017-0091].

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Ponnekanti on the method of determining the traffic channel fading condition due to increase in relative movement between the first and the second station to include in the system of Zhang et al. do determine the traffic channel condition is unfavorable if a first station and a second station travel at a high velocity in relation to each other and the first station originates the feedback channel and the second station originates the transmission channel.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art in reference here are Zhang et al. and Ponnekanti.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to the attention to Venkatesh Haliyur whose phone number is 571-272-8616. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00AM to 5:00 PM. If

Art Unit: 2664

attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wellington Chin can be reached @ (571)-272-3134. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (571)-272-2600 or fax to 571-273-8300.

5. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).


Ajit Patel
Primary Examiner